

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Reply is being filed in response to the final Official Action of July 31, 2007. Initially, Applicants note with appreciation the indication that Claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 20 and 21 are allowable. Nonetheless, the Official Action continues to reject the remaining claims, namely Claims 1-5, 8-12 and 15-19, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,142,843 to Dowling et al. As explained below, however, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is patentable over Dowling, and accordingly traverse this rejection of the claims. In view of the remarks presented herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all of the pending claims of the present application. Alternatively, as the remarks presented herein do not raise any new issues or introduce any new matter, Applicants respectfully request entry of this correspondence for purposes of narrowing the issues upon appeal.

Again, Dowling discloses a geographical web browser that allows a user to navigate a network application, such as the World Wide Web, by physically navigating in geographical coordinates and roaming through coverage areas of cellular base stations, wireless LANs, microcells, and other such broadcast domains. As disclosed, a mobile unit communicates with a network server via an air interface that supports wireless packet data. The mobile unit includes a packet filter that filters local hotspot push messages (messages from a local broadcast domain entity) to see whether those messages coincide with the mobile-unit user's preferences. In this regard, a push message may be used to notify the user that content is available for download (from a network server), or the push message may directly provide that content to the user.

According to one aspect of the present invention, as reflected in independent Claim 1 (and similarly independent Claims 8 and 15), a system is provided for pushing content to a terminal located within a mobile network or a private network. As recited, the system includes a network node (e.g., SIP proxy/registrar) located across a public network (e.g., the Internet) from the mobile/private network including the terminal. The network node is capable of subscribing to a push service on behalf of the terminal such that the network node is also capable of receiving push content in accordance with the push service. The network node is thereafter capable of establishing a network-initiated data session with the terminal, and registering the terminal in

response to the network-initiated data session such that the terminal is capable of receiving the push content based upon the registration.

As explained in response to the first Official Action, in contrast to independent Claim 1 (and similarly independent Claims 8 and 15), Dowling does not teach or suggest a network node located across a public network from a mobile/private network including a terminal, where the network node facilitates pushing content to the terminal. In this regard, Dowling does not teach or suggest such a network node that subscribes to a push service on behalf of the terminal, receives content in accordance with the push service, and thereafter establishes a network-initiated data session with the terminal. Further, Dowling does not teach or suggest registering the terminal in response to the network-initiated data session such that the terminal receives the push content based on the registration. In no instance, however, does Dowling teach or suggest a network entity that is located relative to the terminal as recited by independent Claim 1; and that subscribes to a push service of the local broadcast domain entity on behalf of the terminal, receives push content in accordance with that service, and establishes a network-initiated data session with the terminal to register the terminal and provide that content to the terminal in accordance with the registration.

In response to the foregoing, the final Official Action notes that Dowling discloses a mobile network connection, and a user packet filter that may be downloaded from a web page. Further, the final Official Action notes a scenario disclosed by Dowling whereby a user enters a local broadcast domain (allegedly, inherently including registering with the local domain), and communicates an interest in seeing a dentist to a local broadcast domain entity. If a local dentist is registered with the local broadcast domain entity, the local broadcast domain entity may transmit a packet related to the dentist back to the user.

Even considering the aforementioned disclosure, Applicants note that Dowling still does not teach or suggest the claimed invention. The Official Action may suggest that the disclosed user packet filter corresponds to the recited network node. But as disclosed by Dowling, the packet filter is resident on the user's mobile unit (that receives information within a local broadcast domain), and not located across a public network from the network including the mobile unit, similar to the network node of the claimed invention.

Further, even given the scenario of the user seeking a dentist, nowhere does Dowling teach or suggest a remote (across a public network) network node establishing a network-initiated data session with the user's mobile unit, similar to the network node of the claimed invention. Rather, Dowling clearly suggests that the mobile unit itself initiates any data session by which a packet is sent to it. That is, Dowling clearly discloses that the mobile unit sends a user-interest packet to the local broadcast domain entity, which may in response thereto, send a packet back to the mobile unit. The Official Action further suggests that by entering the local broadcast domain, the mobile unit inherently registers with that domain. Even if such were the case, however, nowhere does Dowling explicitly or inherently disclose the mobile unit registering with the local broadcast domain in response to a network-initiated data session, similar to the claimed invention.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that independent Claim 1, similarly independent Claims 8 and 15, and by dependency Claims 2-7, 9-14 and 16-21, are patentably distinct from Dowling. And for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 1-5, 8-12 and 15-19 as being anticipated by Dowling is overcome.

Appl. No.: 10/797,491
Amdt. dated 10/30/2007
Reply to Official Action of July 31, 2007

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. As such, the issuance of a Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested. In order to expedite the examination of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in order to resolve any remaining issues. As explained above, no new matter or issues are raised by this Reply, and as such, Applicants alternatively respectfully request entry of this Reply for purposes of narrowing the issues upon appeal.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Andrew T. Spence
Registration No. 45,699

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111
LEGAL02/30582323v1

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON OCTOBER 30, 2007.